



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of: **Shigeo TANAKA et al.**

Art Unit: **2838**

Application Number: **10/715,390**

Examiner: **Adolf D. Berhane**

Filed: **November 19, 2003**

Confirmation Number: **5463**

For: **POWER SUPPLY CONTROL METHOD, CURRENT-TO-VOLTAGE  
CONVERSION CIRCUIT AND ELECTRONIC APPARATUS**

Attorney Docket Number: **032116**

Customer Number: **38834**

**SUBMISSION OF REMARKS UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114**

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

July 26, 2006

Sir:

Applicants note that the Advisory Action mailed June 28, 2006 concluded that the patentability arguments with respect to the unamended claims in the Amendment under 37 CFR §1.116 filed on June 13, 2006 were not persuasive. However, the Advisory Action provided no reasons why these arguments were not considered persuasive. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to specifically address the patentability arguments set forth under 37 CFR §1.116 in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

William M. Schertler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,348  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt